

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22-26 and 28. Claims 3, 12, 14, 16, 20, 22-26 and 28 are amended herein. Claims 1, 2, 5-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21 and 27 remain cancelled. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22-26 and 28 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

OBJECTION TO CLAIM 28:

On page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 28. Claim 28 is amended herein.

Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112¶2:

On page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 20, 22-26 and 28 under § 112¶2. Claims 3, 12, 14, 16, 20, 22-26 and 28 are amended herein to clarify the invention.

The claimed invention enables a user to select an object of use or purpose and subsequently identifies one or more commodities having a specification that meets the selected object of use. For example, as illustrated in Fig. 12 of the Application, a user wanting to make a CD, will select "desire to make music CD" from the use purpose list and is provided with CD-R drive integrated as the specification of a commodity that meets the user's selected purpose of use.

Page 4, lines 5-13 of the present application also states, "displaying items for a plurality of objects of use", "retrieving the commodities based on at least one object of use" and then "displaying information on a commodity having specifications corresponding to the selected object of use." See also, page 9, lines 1-5; page 13, lines 3-26; page 15, lines 23-27 and Figs. 7 and 9 including corresponding texts.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

Claims 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22-26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,064,982 (Puri).

The Examiner indicates that list (60) of company and/or partner products in Fig. 5 of Puri and col. 5, lines 26-31 and col. 6, lines 34-54 teach the claimed table indicative of “a correspondence between the objects of use and necessary specifications required [for] the commodities” and “acquiring a specification... subsequent to selection of the at least one object of use indicating a desired operation”, recited in claim 3.

These portions of Puri specifically state:

“FIG. 5 is an illustration of a product choice page for the smart configurator of FIG. 1 according to the invention. This page provides a list 60 of company and/or partner products. This page is presented automatically after the customers needs have been assessed and provides a list of products that most nearly fill the customer's needs. The product box may be manually checked, if desired, although the needs identification dialog typically results in an automatic product selection, which is identified by a check that is automatically placed in the box associated with the selected product.”

(col. 5, lines 25-35 of Puri)

“Although the invention is described herein with reference to the preferred embodiment, one skilled in the art will readily appreciate that other applications may be substituted for those set forth herein without departing from the spirit and scope of the present invention. For example, the invention provides tool for needs assessment that includes an application in the form of a series of cascading style sheets that assists a user in assessing a solution for the user's needs; a browser for progressing through the style sheets during an interactive, user needs assessment session; means for automatically recommending a solution that most nearly meets the user's needs, based upon the results of the interactive user needs assessment session; and means for maintaining information used by the tool during the needs assessment session current by automatically downloading the information to the tool via a channel on an ongoing basis when the user is on-line; wherein the user may use the tool in both an on-line setting and an off-line setting and have access to current information for effecting the needs assessment. Accordingly, the invention should only be limited by the claims included below.”

(col. 6, lines 35-54 of Puri)

As can be seen from the above discussion, these portions of Puri do not discuss “a table indicative of a correspondence between the objects of use and necessary specifications required for the commodities” including “acquiring a specification... subsequent to selection of the at least one object of use indicating a desired operation” (see discussion of claims below). Accordingly, Puri does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not established a priori case of anticipation.

In particular, the Puri system is directed to needs assessment, product/options selection, pricing and product distribution of products in accordance with an interactive product selection

session executed with the customer. The customer selects a software product by checking boxes on HTML forms and the configurator provides appropriate hardware requirements to run the software product selected by the customer (see, col. 3, lines 54-67).

In contrast to Puri, the claimed invention acquires a commodity using a user's selection from displayed objects of use.

Independent claim 3 recites, "displaying objects of use identifying specific operations implemented by commodities on a user's terminal" and "preparing a table indicative of a correspondence between the objects of use and necessary specifications required for the commodities." The method acquires "a specification corresponding to at least one object of use selected by a user via the terminal from the table based on said correspondence... subsequent to selection of the at least one object of use indicating a desired operation from the displayed objects of use of the commodities." This enables retrieval of "commodities based on the acquired specification" and displaying "information on a commodity having specifications corresponding to the selected object of use without requiring the user's knowledge of specifications."

Independent claims 12, 14, 16, 20 and 22 also recite that "necessary specifications for the commodities" correspond to "objects of use" such that when a user selects an object of use, a commodity having the specifications to meet the selected object of use is retrieved.

Independent claim 23 recites, "displaying selectable commodities usage information identifying specific operations implemented by corresponding to commodities via a terminal, said usage information corresponding to specifications required for the commodities." Claim 23 also recites that "a specification corresponding to usage information selected by the user" is acquired subsequent to selection of the usage information to provide "a commodity having specifications corresponding to the selected commodities usage information." Claim 24 recites similar features.

Similarly, claims 25 and 26 recite that "usage information" and "an object of use identifying specific operations" correspond with "specification" of commodities, thereby enabling a user to be provided with a commodity meeting an object of use and usage information specified by the user.

Claim 28 also recites, "determining a commodity meeting a need of a user in response to a selection from operations implemented by components of commodities by the user, said operations corresponding to specifications and object of uses of the commodities" for retrieving

"only a list of commodities matching a desired operation selected from said operations" and "allowing the user to select a commodity from the list."

Puri does not teach or suggest the above-discussed features of the claims including correspondence between "objects of use" and "usage information" pertaining to commodities with "specification" of the commodities to enable selection of commodities by simply identifying a desired object of use, as recited in claims 3, 12, 14, 16, 20, 22-26 and 28.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Puri.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Puri. Claim 4, for example, recites, "a specification corresponding to the at least one object of use" selected by the user is retrieved via a network where "the network is Internet". Puri does not teach or suggest these features of claim 4.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT:

Applicants respectfully request entry of amendments to the claims because the amendments were made to clarify features recited in the claims and do not introduce significant changes that would require a further search.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By: Thomas L. Jones

Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

Date: 12/29/06
1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501